DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 682 CG 016 106

AUTHOR Watson, John Joseph; Remer, Rory
TITLE An Empirical Examination of Confrontation Efficacy I.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 61p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (66th, New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982). For related document, see CG 016 107.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Assertiveness; *Behavior Change; Behavior Patterns; Change Strategies; College Students; *Conflict Resolution; *Emotional Response; *Females; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Relationship; Intervention; Models; *Peer Acceptance
IDENTIFIERS *Confrontation

ABSTRACT

Because people are separate individuals, interpersonal conflict is inevitable. Social psychologists have studied this area by examining styles of conflict resolution such as negotiation/bargaining. Counseling psychologists have attempted to address these concerns through assertiveness and aspects of parenting training. However, no specific model for conflict resolution has been developed and tested empirically. A three-component confrontation model--specified behavior, emotional reaction, consequence of behavior--was examined in an analogue study of angry confrontation between friends, using 48 female college students as subjects, who completed the Expressed Attitude Toward Confrontation Questionnaire (EATCQ). Results indicated that the complete model (all three components present) had as great or significantly greater impact both statistically and practically than any other combination of components or the "no component present" condition on every one of the nine outcome measures employed. Findings were consistent for both male and female confronters. The results suggest that direct, concise criticism, while potentially threatening, may provide a basis for negotiation of changes with female friends whether done by males or other females. (Author/JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219682

An Empirical Examination of Confrontation Efficacy I

John Joseph Watson
University of Kentucky

and

Rory Remer
Associate Professor
University of Kentucky

Presented at the National Meeting of
The American Educational Research Association
March 19-23, 1982
New York, New York

Running head: Confrontation I

CG 016106

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Rory Remer
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

An Empirical Examination of Confrontation Efficacy I

People are different from each other. People interact. As long as these two statements are true, there will inevitably be interpersonal frictions if only as a force for social change (Coser, 1956).

The area of interpersonal conflict and its resolution has long been the focus of intensive study. Reviews by social psychologists Holmes and Miller (1976) and McGrath and Kravitz (1982) demonstrate one approach to the study of this topic. The emphasis of this perspective is on the development of paradigms to explain and reproduce naturally occurring phenomena. The research is extensive and provides valuable insights into interpersonal dynamics but little is aimed at the formulation of specific interventions; general classes of action are more the rule (e.g., bargaining is a suggested strategy and may even be defined by a set of criteria but a specific method or model of bargaining is not delineated.)

A class of conflict resolution strategies -- one directed more at the needs of counseling psychologists for specific interventions is Assertiveness Training. Here too, however, the emphasis is more on general descriptions/distinctions and types of methods for training clients in assertive behavior aquisition (Jakubowski, 1977a). While empirical support for the components of this training approach are abundant (Jakubowski, 1977b), little if any empirical exploration has been done on specific models for conflict resolution. The aim of this study was to fill that gap through the testing of a

specifically structured approach to conflict resolution: interpersonal confrontation.

The Three Component Confrontation Model

The research into conflict resolution has been more on a macro/general level. For example, negotiation/bargaining strategies have been explored extensively (Holmes & Miller, 1976), but no specifics have been offered regarding how to initiate strategies or the best form for such interventions to take, even though evidence exists that specific structure to the conflict situation reduces threat and stress thus facilitating interaction (Cohen, 1959). Although empirical evidence abounds which would lead to the generation of particular models, few have been suggested (Gordon, 1970; Magnavita, Chadbourne & Wicas, 1990) and even these, as already noted, have no empirical evidence supporting their use.

The Confrontation model tested in the present study is based on theory developed by Gordon (1970) in his Parent Effectiveness Training approach. Gordon characterizes effective confrontation in terms of "I-messages." Messages of this type are designed to engender dialogue, mutual involement (Holmes & Miller, 1976), between confronter and confrontee regarding the effect of a specific behavior of the confrontee on the confronter, i.e., the use of "no lose" conflict resolution strategies producing promotive relationshops (Deutsch , 1973). Other types of statements ("You-messages") tend to be judgmental, accusing and do not offer further involvement or interaction. They are more likely to produce

defensiveness, anger, or similar reactions which are barriers to effective communication (Holmes & Miller, 1976).

"I-message" confrontations are comprised of three components: a specification of the confrontee's behavior which is the focus of a request for change, the resulting feelings ("owned" by the confronter) and the effect/consequence of the behavior on the confronter. The confrontation takes the form: "When you _____ (behavior), I feel _____ (feeling), because _____ (consequence)." (Bolton, 1979) Thus the model addresses the two primary levels involved in interpersonal conflict, affective and cognitive (Ruble & Thomas, 1976).

Each of the components is intended to add to the impact of the communication. Support for the inclusion of a cognitive aspect comes from empirical studies by Brehmer (1976) and Padgett and Wolosin (1980).

Specifying the behavior, i.e. making the conflict more concrete (Holmes & Miller, 1976), indicates not only the behavior which is the focus of the confrontation/request for change, but the particular circumstances allowing for both generalization and discrimination -- hence the less ambiguous the situation and the more alternatives perceived by those involved in the conflict (Deutsch, 1973; Komorita & Kravitz, 1979; Komorita, Lapworth & Tumonis, 1981; Miller & Holmes, 1975). Thus distinctions can be made between situations and the variables within them making the mutual contract for change more easily negotiable and viable.

The feeling supplies the impact of the behavior on the confronter. It thus indicates the motivation for the requested change. "Owning" it - saying the feeling in the "I feel" manner - makes it a report of an internal state, taking it out of the realm of accusation. The intention is to eliminate, as much as possible, the blaming stance communicated by the wording "You made me feel. . ." which tends to engender defensiveness, the natural tendency to attribute causation of negative emotions to personal rather than impersonal forces (Kelley, 1971; Miller & Norman, 1975).

The consequence component is an attempt to extend the confrontees perception of the situation by indicating the result of the behavior on the confronter, effects perhaps unknown or unrecognized by the confrontee. The consequence tends to legitimize the confrontation by providing data to the confrontee. This information can be of two types in legitimate confrontations (nonlegitimate confrontations are actually disguised values conflicts), either consequential or interpretive. (Holmes and Miller (1976) make this distinction using the terms "realistic" and "autistic" respectively.) In a consequential confrontation the effect is readily observable, empirical and objective. In the interpretive type the effect -- due to an interpretation of the confrontee's behavior -- is on the relationship, the confronter's perception of the relationship or the confronter's reaction to the confrontee. Interpretive confrontations tend to request clarificaton of the intention of the behavior and/or the status of the

relationship as a prelude to and facilitation of the negotiation of a contract for change (Kelley, Shure, Deutsch, Faucheux, Lanzetta, Moscovici, Nutin, Rabbie & Thibaut, 1970).

Problem Statement

Gordon's (1970) PET Approach is widely disseminated and discussed (e.g., Moreland & Schwebel, 1981; Resnick, 1981). However, little effort has been expended establishing empirical support for the approach (Tramontana, Sherrets & Authier, 1980). The research which has been conducted is not empirically sound enough to provide adequate substantiation for the use of PET methods (Rinn & Markle, 1977; Tavormina, 1980). In particular, the use of "I-message" confrontation, while logically compelling, has no direct empirical support.

Does this confrontation model function at all, let alone as predicted? Are each of the components necessary? And, if so, how does each contribute to attaining the desired effect of the confrontation (control of defensiveness and the negotiation of a mutual "no lose" contract for behavior change)? Will these effects be consistent independent of other situational variables such as the sex of the confronter? These are the questions the present study was designed to address.

Method

Subjects

The subjects were 48 female undergraduate volunteers enrolled in the Human Development and Learning course at the University of Kentucky. Originally the study was designed to

include a gender of confrontee factor. However, there were an insufficient number of males available in the subject pool to allow such arrangements.

Subjects were all sophomores or juniors between the ages of 18-22. All were education majors intending to become classroom teachers.

Procedures

To test the efficacy of the confrontation model an analogue procedure was employed. While there are limitations to analogue studies (Munley, 1974), the relative control and safety afforded were deemed necessary in an initial exploration.

Since confrontations take place in many contexts, decisions had to be made to limit the study in reasonable and representative ways. Accordingly the feeling component was specified to be anger; the behavior was specified as being late for an appointment; and the consequence, lack of respect, was interpretive (being generally more common than consequential confrontations). These choices were made to provide a common situation to which most subjects could relate and because the confrontation could take place either in a counseling, business or friendly context, providing a basis for comparison in future studies.

For this study the situation was structured to produce a confrontation between friends. This circumstance was chosen as the most universal and least threatening of the options available, thus the easiest one with which subjects could

identify. Also, more interpersonal conflict is manifest when the individual power of those involved is equal (Thibaut & Faucheux, 1965), thus providing a sterner test for the model.

To assess the effect of the different components of the model, 16 videotape confrontations were recorded. Eight of the confrontations were by a single female confronter and the other eight by a single male, thus including gender of confronter as a factor in the design.

The two sets of eight confrontations were designed to assess the effects of all components of the model individually and in combination. The segments of the videotape thus ranged from no components present to all components present, i.e., the full model. The eight segments are presented in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

An accuracy check was performed after the videotapes were made to insure that the confrontations seemed realistic and true to the model. The videotape was viewed by six experts, licensed psychologists and advanced graduate students, trained in confrontation using this model. Based on the experts' feedback, adjustments were made and the final versions of the videotapes incorporating the order factor were produced.

Order of presentation of the components -- whether subjects saw the full model first or whether segments presented built toward the full model -- was considered a possible confounding variable. To assess and control for these effects the order of presentation of the number of components was varied in four ways: ascending (0, 1, 2, 3),

descending (3, 2, 1, 0) and two arbitrary orders (2, 0, 3, 1) and (1, 3, 0, 2).

These arrangements represent two compromises with the optimal situation, i.e., total randomization of segments. Since there are 40,320 permutations (possible orders) of eight segments (the number of permutations of 16 segments is an astronomical figure), it was obviously a practical impossibility to produce on tape for each possible ordering. In addition, not all possible orderings within combinations (e.g., behavior-consequences as compared with consequence-behavior) were sensible. The logical ordering consistent with the original model was, therefore, maintained throughout (i.e., behavior-feeling, feelingconsequence, behavior-consequence). The four orderings employed in the study were selected to control for ordering effects and to provide information regarding the cumulative effects of the model components on learning this confrontation style.

Finally, to control for the possible impact of male versus female confrontee, the subjects were randomly divided. Half saw the male confronter first, then the female. The other subjects viewed the segments with female confronter first.

The 48 subjects were assembled in a room. Informed consent was elicited and they were then randomly assigned to each of the 8 cells (2 gender orders x 4 presentation orders) of the design. (There was one minor error in assignment so that the cells were sightly unbalanced).

After the subjects were moved to the rooms for the presentation of the videotapes, they were given a few minutes to familiarize themselves with the questions/instrument with which they were going to be asked to respond. Subjects' questions regarding the procedures were answered. They were also informed that they would be debriefed after the experiment.

Instructions regarding the situation in which the subjects were to try to place themselves were read. They were informed that they were to assume that: 1) they had a strong mutual relationship with the person they would be viewing; 2) they were peers/equals with the person (not student-teacher, employee-employer, etc.); 3) they were approximately the same age as the person; and 4) they were both the same educational, socio-economic and religious background.

They were then told to: "Put yourself in the situation and respond to the ten questions as you would if you were confronted by a friend as just described." (Each video segment was preceded by a short lead in attempting to induce a further sense of familiarity with the situation so that subjects would not "come in cold").

After each of the 16 segments, subjects were instructed to respond using the ten item Expressed Attitude Toward Confrontation Questionnaire. Approximately 60 seconds were allowed for subjects response between the showing of segments.

Instrumentation

The reactions of the subjects to the components of the model were assessed by developing an instrument expressly for rating confrontations. The Expressed Attitude Toward Confrontation Questionnaire (EATCQ) was composed of ten items, nine dealing with the reactions to the confrontation and one asking how well the subjects were able to imagine themselves in the situation(a reality check).

The questions were direct and unambigious dealing with the various aspects/intentions of the interaction important to reduction of interpersonal conflict (Holmes & Miller, 1976):

How clear is the confrontation? Do you know what you are being confronted about?

How much would you change your behavior as a result of this confrontation?

How much do you feel open to negotiation with your confronter? That is, would you be willing to talk over the problem and try to strike a compromise?

How much do you understand the confrontation from the confronter's point of view?

To what extent do you feel angry?

To what extent do you feel defensive?

To what extent do you want to withdraw from the confrontation? That is, do you feel like walking away from your confronter?

To what extent do you want to withdraw from the relationship with your confronter? That is, do you wnat to end the friendship?

Overall, how would you rate this confrontation as to effectiveness?

How well were you able to put yourself into the role of the confrontee?

Five point Likert-scales were used to elicit subjects' ratings. Each point on the scales was anchored by a

description of the subjects' possible response. (See Table 3 for end point anchors.) Half the scales were designed to be reverse scored to control for possible acquiescence set. The questionnaire was field tested and revised to insure that the final form was clear and understandable.

Analysis

Because of the complexity of the design and the amount of data collected a multiple stage, branching analysis was performed. At the grossest level of aggregation an 8 x 4 x 2 (component x order x sex of confronter) Repeated Measures Multiple Analysis of Variance was done across all ten items of the EATCQ. Next ten 8 x 4 x 2 Univariate Repeated Measures Analyses of Variance, one for each item, were calculated. Finally, post hoc multiple comparisons using Duncan's Multiple Range statistic were performed on each individual factor found significant at the $p < .01$ level for each of the aspects rated on the EATCQ.

The factor of order of presentation of sex of confrontee was employed only as a control variable. It did not enter the analysis. In addition, a decision was made to evaluate at the alpha = .01 level because of the large number of degrees of freedom in the analyses, producing statistically significant results of little or no practical significance.

Results

Multivariate Analysis

The results of the 8 x 4 x 2 (component x order x sex of confronter) repeated measures multiple analysis of variance

across all ten items of the EATCQ are presented in Table 2. The Wilk's Criterion for each source of variation has been converted to an approximate F-value for easier interpretation. The variance/covariance matrices which vary according to the appropriate error for a particular component are not presented since they would consume an inordinate amount of journal space being 10 x 10. They are available from the authors upon request.

Significant effects were obtained due to component of the model, order of presentation and the component x order interaction. By far the most significant effect can be attributed to the influence of the different components of the model.

Univariate Analyses

An 8 x 4 x 2 (component x order x sex of confronter) univariate repeated measures analysis was performed for each of the ten EATCQ questions. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 3. The means, standard deviations and cell sizes which correspond to these analyses are not presented due to space limitations. They are also available from the authors upon request.

In each case the effect of the components of the model was highly significant ($p<.001$). On the ratings of "clarity of confrontation", "possibility of behavior change", "angry reaction"and "defensiveness" a significant order effect was also observed. Also, a significant component x order interaction was obtained for ratings of "angry reaction" and

"desire to withdraw from the confrontation" and a significant component x sex interaction on "effectiveness of confrontation".

In interpreting the significant effects, the problem of correlated errors which leads to a non-homogeneous variance/covariance matrix presents itself. In each of the analyses a significant Greenhouse-Geiser probability was calculated indicating that the significant results obtained could be an artifact of this assumption violation. In order to cope with this problem the procedure suggested by Greenhouse and Geiser (1959) was employed. A liberal test using the maximum appropriate degrees of freedom available for the numerator and conservative test employing only one degree of freedom for the numerator were conducted. This procedure indicated that all but the significant component effects were equivocal, i.e., significant on the liberal test but not on the conservative one.

Following this result, cell means for the interaction effects were examined; the strength of the significance for order and interactions were compared to those for the components; and Duncan's Multiple Range test for the order effects was computed. None of these analyses produce interpretable results. Considering the equivocal outcomes and the large number of degrees of freedom in the analysis which tended to produce significant results without practical implications, further exploration of all but the component effects were terminated.

Multiple Comparisons

In order to investigate the effects of the individual components of the model and combinations of the components the Duncan's Multiple Range statistic was calculated for each of the ten questions of the EATCQ. The results of these analyses are presented in Figures 1-10. The figures are arranged so that positive outcomes/ratings are consistently to the right for easier comparison.

Insert Figures 1-10 about here

Although it is difficult to generalize across all ten items, one outcome is consistent, the full model (behavior, feeling and consequence combined) produced as positive if not a significantly more positive reaction in every instance. The only other result obtained with anywhere near that consistency is that the "no component" condition and the "feeling" alone condition tend to produce the most negative reactions, being generally rated at or near the lower end of each scale. Except for "overall effectiveness" and "identification", the "behavior" description alone or in combination with other components has the most significant positive effect. Other possible patterns will be noted in the discussion section.

Practical Significance

The large number of statistically significant results in the hypothesized direction are encouraging and informative. However, the large number of degrees of freedom available in the analyses could produce these findings even with relatively minor differences in the subjects' reactions.

What are the practical implications of the use of the model? To answer this question, the range of the mean ratings on each item were examined. In looking at the differences in the ratings of the ten aspects of confrontation, practical significances - shifts in reactions from neutral position or one end of the continuum to the other - were obtained in every instance, except "Desire to withdraw from the relationship." Only this one rating failed to produce an indication of a practical shift in attitude, even though a statistical significant result was observed.

Discussion

The results indicate overwhelming support for the use of the full model when confronting females whether the confronter is male or female. The consistency of these findings across all dimensions of the EATCQ provide vindication for the use of the full model as an effective form of communication in all instances.

Worth noting is that the behavioral description alone seems to produce positive reactions. This finding would lead one to believe that direct, concise criticism, while potentially threatening, can provide a basis for negotiation of changes with female friends whether done by males or other females. This finding is congruent with those noted earlier from the Social Psychology literature.

While there are many other conclusions to be drawn from the wealth of information collected in the present study, one which leads to a whole area of possible further exploration is

particularly worthy of commentary. On the question of whether the female subjects could identify with the confrontee, the most confrontive/threatening aspects of the model - overt (explicit feeling) and covert (no specific component) feeling expression - produced the least identification, in fact, almost to the point of indicating the absence of these types of interactions from conscious consideration. Such absence of identification could indicate a lack of familiarity with these situations in real life. This possibility hardly seems likely, however. More reasonably one could infer that females tend to repress or suppress conscious reactions to threatening, unpleasant communications. These results, particularly if found to be incongruent with results for male subjects, could lend further support to and could provide insight into the process of sex role development and its effect on interpersonal communication styles.

The most glaring need for further investigation is the replication of this study with male subjects. At present, the full model has been validated for use with females by members of either sex. Will these findings pertain to confrontation with males? There are no reasons to believe otherwise, but these are questions which must be addressed since gender differences (Kimmel, Pruitt, Magenau, Konar-Goldband & Carnevale, 1980) and personality differences (Hermann & Kogan, 1977) have been found in interpersonal conflict situations.

Similarly, questions of whether similar outcomes could be obtained with other populations are worth addressing.

Certainly the effects of other cultural, economic and social backgrounds require exploration.

Conclusion

Since the options included in the design of this study were chosen to be realistic (being late for an appointment) most typical (an interpretation of a friend's behavior as the consequence) and most threatening (angry feelings), it seems reasonable to conclude that other possible - e.g., feelings of hurt or concern, other specific behaviors or more observable consequences, other types of relationships such as counselor/client - would produce equally or more salutory effects. However, these are questions which can be easily addressed empirically in future studies. The strength of the results would indicate that such further exploration would prove profitable and should be done.

Conflict in interpersonal relationships is inevitable. There is every indication that the three component model tested can provide a viable means for facilitating negotiation and possible resolution of such conflict. The specificity of the model goes far in making it an understandable, adaptable and teachable method for helping persons communicate their frictions effectively.

References

Brehmer, B. Social judgment theory and the analysis of interpersonal conflict. Psychological Bulletin, 1976, 83 (6), 985-1003.

Cohen, A. R. Situation structure, self-esteem and threat-oriented reactions to power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.) Studies in social power, University of Michigan, 1959.

Coser, L. The function of social conflict. Free Press, 1956.

Deutsch, M. The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes. Yale University Press, 1973.

Gordon, T. Parent effectiveness training. New York: Peter H. Wyden, 1970.

Greenhouse, S. W., & Geisser, S. On methods in the analysis of profile data. Psychometrika, 1959, 24, 95-112.

Hermann, M. G., & Kogan, N. Effects of negotiators personalities on negotiating behavior. In D. Druckman (Ed.), Negotiations: Social psychological perspectives. London: Sage, 1977, 247-274.

Holmes, J. G., & Miller, D. T. Interpersonal conflict. In J. W. Thibaut, J. T. Spence & R. C. Carson (Eds.) Contemporary topics in social psychology. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1976, 265-307.

Jakubowski, P. A. Assertive behavior and clinical problems of women. In E. I. Rawlings & D. K. Carter (Eds.) Psychotherapy for women. Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas, 1977a, 147-168.

Jakubowski, P. A. Self-assertion training for women. In E. I. Rawlings & D. K. Carter (Eds.) Psychotherapy for women. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1977b, 168-193.

Kelley, H. H. Attribution in social interaction. In E. E. Jones, D. E. Kanouse, H. H. Kelley, R. E. Nisbett, S. Valins & B. Weiner (Eds.) Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior, General Learning Press, 1971.

Kelley, H. H., Shure, G. H., Deutsh, M., Faucheux, C., Lanzetta, J. T., Mascovici, S., Nutin, J. M., Rabbie, J. M., & Thibaut, J. W. Comparative experimental study of negotiation behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 411-438.

Kimmel, M. j., Pruitt, D. G., Magenau, J. M., Konar-Goldband, E., & Carnevale, P. J. D. Effects of trust, aspiration, and gender on negotiation tactics. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 38 (1), 9-22.

Komorita, S. S., & Kravitz, D. A. The effects of alternatives in bargaining. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1979, 15, 147-157.

Komorita, S. S., Lapworth, C. W., & Tumonis, T. M. The effects of certain vs. risky alternatives in bargaining. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1981, 17 (6), 525-544.

Magnavita, J., Chadbourne, J., & Wicas, A. Confrontation: A taxonomy of behaviors. Unpublished manuscript, 1980.

McGrath, J. E., & Kravitz, D. A. Group research. Annual Review of Psychology, 1982, 33, 195-230.

Miller, D. T., & Holmes, J. G. The role of situational restrictiveness on self-fulfilling prophecies: A theoretical and empirical extension of Kelley and Stahleski's triangle hypothesis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 661-673.

Miller, D. T., & Norman, S. A. Actor-observer differences in perceptions of effective control. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 503-515.

Moreland, M., & Schwebel, A. I. A gender role transcendent perspective on fathering. The Counseling Psychologist, 1981, 9 (4), 45-55.

Munley, P. H. A review of counseling analogue research methods. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 320-330.

Padgett, V. R., & Wolosin, R. J. Cognitive similarity in dyadic communication. Journal of Personal and Social Psychology, 1980, 39 (4), 654-659.

Resnick, J. L. Parent education and the female parent. The Counseling Psychologist, 1981, 9 (4), 55-63.

Rinn, R. C., & Markle, A. Parent effectiveness training: A review. Psychological Reports, 1977, 41, 95-109.

Ruble, T. L., & Thomas, K. W. Support for a two dimensional model of conflict. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1976, 16, 143-155.

Thibaut, J. W., & Faucheux, C. The development of contractual norms in a bargaining situation under too types of

stress. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 87-102.

Tavormina, J. B. Evaluation and comparative studies of parent education. In R. R. Abidin (Ed.) Parent education and intervention handbook. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1980.

Tramontana, M. G., Sherrets, S. D., & Authier, K. J. Evaluation of parent education programs. Journal of Child Clinical Psychology, 1980, 9 (1), 40-43.

Bolton, R.
People Skills. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979

Table 1
Videotape Segment Formats

Segment	# of Components Present	Combination of Components	Actual Wording
1	0	none	"Damn you!"
2	1	behavior	"You're late for our appointment."
3	1	feeling	"I'm really angry."
4	1	consequence	"I think you have no respect for me or my time."
5	2	feeling and behavior	"I'm really angry because you're late for this appointment."
6	2	feeling and consequence	"I'm really angry because I think you have no respect for me or my time."
7	2	behavior and consequence	"You're late for our appointment and I think you have no respect for me or my time."
8	3	behavior, feeling and consequence	"When you're late for our appointment, I feel angry because I think you have no respect for me or my time."

Table 2

8 x 4 x 2 Repeated Measures MANOVA:[1] Component x Order x Sex of Confronter

Source of Variation	Wilks' Criterion	F Value Approximation	df	p
Component (C)	0.11	12.03[2]	70/1872	0.000
Order (O)	0.27	2.13	31/112	0.002
Sex of confronter (S)	0.70	1.66	10/38	0.128
C x O	0.43	1.36	210/2925	0.001
C x S	0.80	1.04	70/1872	0.400
O X S	0.33	1.72	30/112	0.023
C x O x S	0.47	1.22	210/2925	0.020

[1]Run on SAS (Statistical Analysis System). Variance/Covariance Matrices are too numerous and too large (10 x 10) to include in the article. They can be obtained from the author.

[2]Underlined F-values are significant $p < .01$.

Table 3

8 x 2 x 4 Repeated Measures Univariate ANOVA (Component x Order x Sex of Confronter)

Aspect Assessed	Range of Assessment	Source of Variation	MS	df	Error MS	df	F	p
Clarity of confrontation	1 = Totally clear 5 = Vague	Component (C)	137.01	7	1.00	308	136.43*	0.00
		Order (O)	10.61	3	2.15	44	4.93	0.00
		Sex of confronter (S)	0.12	1	0.61	44	.20	0.65
		C x O	1.76	21	1.00	308	1.75	0.02
		C x S	0.30	7	1.00	308	0.75	0.63
		O x S	1.10	3	0.61	44	1.80	0.16
		C x O x S	0.44	21	4.00	308	1.12	0.33
Possibility of behavior change	1 = Definitely would remain unchanged 5 = Definitely would change	Component (C)	30.60	7	0.95	308	32.04	0.00
		Order (O)	21.93	3	4.50	44	4.87	0.01
		Sex of confronter (S)	1.96	1	0.61	44	3.21	0.08
		C x O	0.82	21	0.95	308	0.86	0.64
		C x S	0.14	7	0.38	308	0.36	0.92
		O x S	0.61	3	0.61	44	1.01	0.40
		C x O x S	0.28	21	0.38	308	0.76	0.77
Willing to discuss/ negotiate problem	5 = Totally closed 1 = Totally open	Component (C)	27.25	7	0.70	308	39.15	0.00
		Order (O)	7.59	3	3.59	44	2.11	0.11
		Sex of confronter (S)	0.00	1	0.52	44	0.00	0.95
		C x O	1.01	21	0.70	308	1.44	0.10
		C x S	0.45	7	0.33	308	1.38	0.21

Table 3 (Con't)

Aspect Assessed	Range of Assessment	Source of Variation	MS	df	Error MS	df	F	p
		O x S	2.03	3	0.52	44	3.88	0.02
		C x O x S	0.55	21	0.33	308	1.69	0.03
Understand confronter's perspective	1 = Totally confused 5 = Totally understand	Component (C)	8.29	7	0.76	308	109.48	0.00
		Order (O)	6.89	3	2.71	44	2.54	0.07
		Sex of confronter (S)	0.15	1	0.42	44	0.36	0.55
		C x O	1.05	21	0.76	308	1.38	0.13
		C x S	0.21	7	0.32	308	0.66	0.70
		O x S	0.37	3	0.42	44	2.33	0.09
		C x O x S	0.33	21	0.32	308	1.04	0.42
Angry	5 = Not at all 1 = Livid	Component (C)	19.26	7	0.53	308	36.01	0.00
		Order (O)	19.65	3	3.18	44	6.18	0.00
		Sex of confronter (S)	0.99	1	0.37	44	2.65	0.11
		C x O	1.66	21	0.53	308	3.09	0.00
		C x S	0.38	7	0.33	308	1.14	0.34
		O x S	0.71	3	0.37	44	1.90	0.14
		C x O x S	0.49	21	0.33	308	1.47	0.09
Defensive	1 = Not at all 5 = Totally defensive	Component (C)	14.50	7	0.70	308	20.73	0.00
		Order (O)	18.90	3	3.13	44	6.04	0.00
		Sex of confronter (S)	0.06	1	0.46	44	0.12	0.73

Table 3 (Con't)

Aspect Assessed	Range of Assessment	Source of Variation	MS	df	Error MS	df	F	p
		C x O	1.80	21	0.70	308	2.57	0.00
		C x S	0.34	7	0.39	308	0.88	0.52
		O x S	0.44	3	0.46	44	0.95	0.42
		C x O x S	0.52	21	0.39	308	1.32	0.16
Want to withdraw from confrontation	5 = Don't want to withdraw at all 1 = Definitely want to withdraw	Component (C)	17.33	7	0.80	308	21.54	0.00
		Order (O)	13.99	3	4.82	44	2.90	0.05
		Sex of confronter (S)	0.15	1	0.69	44	0.21	0.65
		C x O	1.01	21	0.80	308	1.25	0.21
		C x S	0.28	7	0.40	308	0.70	0.67
		O x S	0.03	3	0.69	44	0.04	0.99
		C x O x S	0.21	21	0.40	308	0.53	0.96
Want to withdraw from relationship	1 = Don't want to withdraw at all 5 = Definitely want to withdraw	Component (C)	11.34	7	0.55	308	20.59	0.00
		Order (O)	9.14	3	4.34	44	2.11	0.11
		Sex of confronter (S)	0.20	1	0.21	44	0.94	0.34
		C x O	1.32	21	0.55	308	2.40	0.00
		C x S	0.16	7	0.25	308	0.63	0.73
		O x S	0.36	3	0.21	44	1.74	0.17
		C x O x S	0.31	21	0.25	308	1.25	0.21

Table 3 (Con't)

Aspect Assessed	Range of Assessment	Source of Variation	MS	df	Error MS	df	F	p
Effectiveness of confrontation	1 = Totally effective 5 = Totally ineffective	Component (C)	41.92	7	1.07	308	39.21	0.00
		Order (O)	5.88	3	4.24	44	1.39	0.26
		Sex of confronter (S)	0.17	1	0.67	44	0.26	0.61
		C x O	1.35	21	1.07	308	1.26	0.20
		C x S	1.35	7	0.45	308	2.99	0.00
		O x S	2.34	3	0.67	44	3.52	0.02
		C x O x S	0.71	21	0.45	308	1.57	0.06
Able to identify with confrontee	1 = Not at all 5 = Totally in role	Component (C)	24.30	7	0.87	308	28.04	0.00
		Order (O)	6.33	3	4.47	44	1.41	0.25
		Sex of confronter (S)	0.32	1	0.62	44	0.53	0.47
		C x O	1.20	21	0.87	308	1.38	0.12
		C x S	1.10	7	0.39	308	0.25	0.97
		O x S	0.41	3	0.62	44	0.67	0.58
		C x O x S	0.58	21	0.39	308	1.48	0.08

*Underlined F ratios are significant $p<.01$.

Table 4

Cell Means and Standard Deviations for Ten Confrontation Aspects Assessed

Gender of Confronter:	Male								Female							
Order of Presentation:	Ascending (All cells for Ascending n = 13)								Ascending							
Component of Model:	None	B	F	C	BF	FC	BC	BFC	None	B	F	C	BF	FC	BC	BFC
Aspect																
Clarity (R)	4.54 (0.52)	2.46 (1.13)	4.46 (0.78)	3.62 (0.87)	2.08 (0.76)	3.00 (1.15)	1,85 (0.80)	1.54 (0.78)	4.62 (0.65)	2.15 (1.21)	4.69 (0.48)	3.00 (1.15)	1.54 (0.78)	3.00 (1.08)	1.77 (0.73)	1.54 (0.88)
Change	2,85 (1.21)	3.30 (0.95)	2.69 (0.75)	3.08 (0.95)	3.46 (0.88)	3.23 (0.93)	3.69 (0.85)	4.08 (0.76)	3.15 (1.07)	3.00 (0.82)	2.62 (0.87)	3.38 (0.96)	3.62 (0.77)	3.31 (0.75)	3.62 (0.77)	4.00 (1.00)
Negotiation (R)	3.46 (1.13)	2.77 (0.83)	3.23 (0.73)	3.00 (0.58)	2.77 (0.60)	3.00 (0.58)	2.54 (0.66)	2.31 (0.85)	3.23 (1.24)	2.38 (0.96)	2.92 (0.49)	2.77 (0.73)	2.08 (0.86)	2.92 (0.49)	2.85 (0.69)	2.08 (1.04)
Understanding	1.69 (0.63)	2.92 (0.95)	1.85 (0.69)	2.54 (0.97)	3.46 (0.88)	2.77 (0.83)	3.77 (0.93)	4.08 (0.95)	1.77 (0.60)	3.23 (1.67)	1.92 (0.49)	3.00 (0.91)	4.00 (0.82)	3.15 (1.07)	3.62 (0.87)	4.08 (0.86)
Anger	3.46 (0.97)	3.48 (0.65)	4.08 (0.86)	3.92 (0.76)	4.31 (0.63)	3.69 (0.48)	4.08 (0.76)	4.31 (0.63)	4.00 (0.82)	4.69 (0.48)	4.46 (0.78)	4.31 (0.63)	4.62 (0.51)	3.92 (0.28)	3.92 (0.86)	4.31 (0.75)
Defensiveness (R)	3.00 (1.15)	2.31 (0.63)	2.46 (0.78)	2.54 (0.66)	2.38 (0.77)	2.54 (0.78)	2.15 (0.80)	2.00 (0.58)	2.62 (0.87)	2.31 (1.03)	2.38 (1.04)	2.69 (0.85)	1.92 (0.76)	2.54 (0.78)	2.46 (1.05)	2.15 (0.90)
Withdrawal from Confrontation	3.69 (1.11)	4.38 (0.51)	4.31 (0.85)	4.31 (0.63)	4.46 (0.52)	4.23 (0.60)	4.54 (0.66)	4.54 (0.66)	3.77 (1.30)	4.31 (0.85)	4.31 (0.95)	4.31 (0.95)	4.54 (0.66)	4.46 (0.52)	4.15 (0.80)	4.46 (0.78)
Withdrawal from Relationship (R)	1.77 (0.60)	1.23 (0.44)	1.23 (0.44)	1.38 (0.51)	1.23 (0.44)	1.54 (0.66)	1.31 (0.48)	1.38 (0.51)	1.69 (0.63)	1.54 (1.13)	1.46 (0.78)	1.46 (0.52)	1.23 (0.44)	1.54 (0.52)	1.54 (0.52)	1.38 (0.51)
Effectiveness (R)	4.38 (0.51)	3.62 (0.77)	4.23 (0.73)	3.77 (0.83)	3.00 (0.71)	3.15 (0.80)	2.54 (1.05)	2.23 (1.30)	3.77 (1.09)	3.00 (0.82)	4.15 (0.69)	3.15 (1.14)	2.31 (1.18)	3.31 (1.18)	2.77 (1.09)	2.08 (1.32)
Identification	2.23 (1.17)	2.77 (0.83)	2.23 (0.60)	2.62 (0.87)	3.08 (0.86)	2.77 (0.83)	3.46 (1.05)	3.38 (1.19)	2.31 (0.75)	2.69 (0.95)	1.92 (0.76)	2.62 (1.12)	3.77 (0.73)	2.77 (1.01)	3.54 (0.97)	3.92 (1.04)

Cell = Mean / (SD)

(R) indicates reverse scored item, i.e., a higher score is less desirable

Table 4

Cell Means and Standard Deviations for Ten Confrontation Aspects Assessed

Gender of Confronter:	Male								Female							
Order of Presentation:	Descending (All cells for Descending n = 14)								Descending							
Component of Model:	None	B	F	C	BF	FC	BC	BFC	None	B	F	C	BF	FC	BC	BFC
Aspect																
Clarity (R)	4.57 (0.85)	3.07 (0.73)	4.21 (0.89)	3.79 (0.97)	2.36 (0.63)	3.23 (0.73)	2.57 (0.51)	1.57 (0.65)	4.71 (0.73)	2.64 (0.84)	4.50 (0.76)	4.00 (1.29)	2.71 (0.73)	3.54 (0.94)	2.57 (1.02)	2.07 (0.83)
Change	1.57 (1.16)	2.71 (0.73)	1.71 (0.73)	2.43 (1.16)	3.14 (0.86)	2.79 (0.89)	3.07 (0.92)	3.79 (0.89)	1.64 (1.34)	2.86 (0.95)	1.57 (1.02)	2.36 (1.01)	2.79 (0.80)	2.42 (1.16)	2.93 (0.83)	3.50 (1.02)
Negotiation (R)	4.36 (1.01)	3.21 (0.89)	3.21 (1.12)	3.43 (1.09)	3.00 (0.55)	3.43 (0.85)	3.21 (0.58)	2.50 (1.09)	4.00 (1.52)	2.86 (0.95)	3.50 (1.22)	3.71 (0.99)	3.00 (0.96)	3.29 (0.99)	2.79 (0.89)	2.57 (0.94)
Understanding	1.14 (0.53)	2.86 (0.66)	1.71 (0.83)	2.21 (0.70)	3.29 (0.47)	2.57 (0.85)	3.21 (0.70)	3.93 (0.83)	1.21 (0.58)	2.93 (1.14)	1.71 (0.99)	1.86 (0.95)	3.07 (0.62)	2.07 (0.83)	3.07 (0.73)	3.93 (0.62)
Anger	2.07 (0.73)	3.79 (0.70)	4.00 (0.96)	3.14 (1.10)	3.71 (0.91)	3.57 (0.85)	3.57 (0.94)	4.29 (0.83)	1.86 (0.77)	4.07 (1.07)	3.71 (1.27)	3.23 (1.07)	3.79 (0.89)	3.71 (1.07)	4.00 (1.04)	3.86 (0.77)
Defensiveness (R)	4.36 (0.63)	2.64 (0.74)	2.14 (1.17)	3.29 (0.73)	2.57 (0.94)	2.86 (0.86)	2.79 (0.89)	2.57 (1.09)	4.43 (0.51)	2.71 (1.07)	2.86 (1.29)	3.23 (1.07)	2.64 (0.74)	2.71 (0.83)	2.64 (0.93)	3.14 (0.95)
Withdrawal from Confrontation	2.36 (1.39)	4.07 (0.92)	3.93 (1.07)	3.64 (1.22)	3.93 (0.83)	3.64 (0.93)	3.71 (1.07)	4.07 (1.27)	2.43 (1.50)	3.79 (1.19)	3.86 (1.03)	3.23 (1.20)	3.93 (0.92)	3.71 (1.20)	3.93 (1.00)	3.93 (0.73)
Withdrawal from Relationship (R)	3.00 (1.47)	1.64 (0.93)	1.57 (0.94)	2.14 (1.17)	1.64 (0.63)	3.00 (1.18)	1.86 (1.03)	1.71 (1.27)	3.29 (1.49)	1.50 (0.80)	1.71 (1.07)	1.23 (1.20)	1.64 (0.74)	1.93 (1.14)	1.79 (0.84)	1.43 (0.65)
Effectiveness (R)	4.50 (0.76)	3.64 (0.63)	4.50 (0.65)	3.93 (0.73)	3.21 (0.70)	3.50 (0.76)	2.79 (0.80)	2.36 (0.93)	4.00 (1.36)	3.36 (0.84)	4.50 (0.85)	4.21 (0.89)	3.43 (0.85)	4.07 (0.83)	3.57 (0.85)	3.07 (0.73)
Identification	2.64 (1.28)	2.86 (0.66)	2.50 (0.85)	2.86 (1.03)	3.07 (0.73)	2.79 (0.70)	3.21 (0.70)	3.43 (0.76)	2.71 (1.33)	3.21 (0.80)	2.21 (0.70)	3.00 (1.04)	3.00 (0.88)	2.86 (0.95)	3.14 (0.95)	3.50 (0.76)

Table 4 (Con't)

Gender of Confronter:	Male								Female							
Order of Presentation:	Random	(All cells for Random n = 13)							Random							
Component of Model:	None	B	F	C	BF	FC	BC	BFC	None	B	F	C	BF	FC	BC	BFC
Aspect																
Clarity (R)	4.62 (1.12)	2.00 (1.00)	4.46 (0.97)	3.62 (0.87)	1.92 (1.26)	2.69 (1.25)	1.77 (0.83)	1.15 (0.38)	4.54 (1.13)	2.46 (1.05)	4.38 (1.12)	3.23 (1.17)	2.08 (0.95)	2.69 (1.11)	1.69 (0.63)	1.23 (0.44)
Change	2.62 (1.76)	3.08 (0.95)	2.23 (1.01)	2.92 (0.64)	3.62 (0.77)	3.38 (1.04)	3.69 (0.85)	3.69 (0.85)	2.46 (1.51)	3.00 (0.58)	2.31 (1.03)	2.77 (0.83)	3.15 (0.80)	3.23 (0.73)	3.62 (0.87)	4.00 (0.91)
Negotiation (R)	4.23 (0.73)	2.85 (0.55)	3.62 (0.87)	3.31 (0.63)	2.38 (0.87)	3.00 (0.71)	2.08 (0.76)	1.92 (0.64)	4.31 (0.63)	2.69 (0.75)	3.62 (0.87)	3.00 (0.58)	3.00 (0.58)	2.92 (0.65)	2.69 (0.75)	2.31 (0.85)
Understanding	1.62 (0.96)	3.00 (0.58)	1.69 (0.48)	2.46 (0.66)	3.31 (1.18)	2.85 (0.90)	3.69 (0.85)	4.23 (0.60)	1.54 (0.52)	2.85 (0.69)	1.69 (0.63)	2.69 (0.95)	3.38 (0.96)	3.23 (1.09)	3.85 (0.80)	3.92 (0.69)
Anger	2.62 (0.96)	4.69 (0.63)	4.00 (1.00)	4.15 (0.80)	4.00 (0.71)	3.62 (0.87)	4.38 (0.51)	4.46 (0.78)	2.92 (0.95)	4.23 (0.73)	4.15 (1.07)	4.15 (0.80)	4.15 (0.80)	4.00 (0.91)	3.92 (0.86)	4.23 (0.83)
Defensiveness (R)	3.62 (1.12)	1.92 (0.86)	2.38 (1.26)	2.31 (0.63)	2.62 (0.77)	2.77 (0.83)	2.15 (0.80)	2.08 (0.69)	3.38 (1.04)	1.92 (0.76)	2.62 (1.19)	2.31 (0.63)	2.23 (0.73)	2.38 (0.87)	2.38 (0.77)	2.15 (1.14)
Withdrawal from Confrontation	3.00 (1.15)	4.54 (0.66)	4.00 (1.15)	4.23 (0.83)	4.46 (0.66)	4.15 (0.90)	4.54 (0.66)	4.77 (0.44)	2.86 (1.14)	4.54 (0.66)	4.00 (1.22)	4.15 (0.99)	4.23 (0.73)	4.46 (0.66)	4.31 (1.03)	4.46 (0.66)
Withdrawal from Relationship (R)	2.62 (1.12)	1.08 (0.28)	1.54 (0.88)	1.54 (0.66)	1.31 (0.48)	1.92 (0.86)	1.15 (0.36)	1.31 (0.63)	3.00 (1.41)	1.46 (0.88)	1.85 (1.14)	1.38 (0.51)	1.46 (0.78)	1.46 (0.52)	1.38 (0.65)	1.31 (0.48)
Effectiveness (R)	3.85 (1.41)	3.62 (1.04)	4.38 (0.51)	3.77 (0.93)	3.46 (1.20)	3.38 (1.04)	2.54 (0.97)	2.54 (0.88)	3.69 (1.60)	4.08 (0.86)	4.00 (1.15)	3.77 (0.83)	3.31 (0.85)	3.31 (0.95)	2.62 (1.12)	2.77 (1.01)
Identification	2.62 (1.37)	2.69 (0.85)	2.31 (0.85)	2.15 (0.69)	2.92 (0.95)	2.38 (0.77)	3.00 (1.00)	3.77 (0.83)	2.77 (1.42)	2.54 (0.78)	2.54 (1.13)	2.46 (0.78)	2.77 (0.93)	2.92 (0.86)	3.38 (0.96)	3.38 (0.87)

Table 4 (Con't)

Gender of Confronter:	Male								Female							
Order of Presentation:	Reverse Random (All cells for Reverse Random n = 11)								Reverse Random							
Component of Model:	None	B	F	C	BF	FC	BC	BFC	None	B	F	C	BF	FC	BC	BFC
Aspect																
Clarity (R)	5.00 (0.00)	2.18 (0.87)	4.82 (0.40)	3.73 (1.35)	2.00 (1.26)	2.27 (1.10)	1.55 (0.69)	1.27 (0.47)	5.00 (0.00)	2.27 (0.79)	4.82 (0.40)	3.27 (1.35)	2.27 (1.10)	2.45 (1.21)	1.82 (0.75)	1.18 (0.40)
Change	1.73 (1.01)	3.27 (1.01)	2.00 (0.89)	2.55 (1.13)	2.73 (1.10)	2.73 (1.01)	3.27 (0.79)	3.73 (1.42)	1.73 (1.01)	2.82 (0.87)	1.55 (0.52)	2.36 (0.81)	2.73 (0.65)	2.45 (0.69)	3.00 (0.77)	3.45 (0.93)
Negotiation (R)	4.18 (0.87)	2.73 (0.90)	3.27 (0.79)	2.73 (0.90)	2.64 (0.81)	2.91 (0.70)	2.73 (0.47)	2.09 (0.83)	4.36 (0.50)	2.73 (0.90)	3.73 (0.47)	3.64 (0.50)	2.73 (0.65)	3.09 (0.83)	2.91 (0.70)	2.09 (0.54)
Understanding	0.27 (0.47)	3.27 (0.90)	1.55 (0.52)	2.18 (0.98)	3.45 (1.21)	3.27 (1.10)	3.82 (0.60)	4.55 (0.69)	1.27 (0.47)	3.09 (1.04)	1.36 (0.50)	2.55 (0.93)	3.36 (0.67)	3.09 (1.04)	3.55 (0.52)	4.36 (0.67)
Anger	3.36 (1.12)	4.45 (0.52)	4.64 (0.50)	4.00 (1.18)	4.82 (0.40)	4.55 (0.52)	4.55 (0.64)	4.55 (0.52)	3.36 (1.12)	4.55 (0.69)	4.55 (0.52)	4.27 (0.90)	4.64 (0.50)	4.45 (0.52)	4.55 (0.52)	4.45 (0.52)
Defensiveness (R)	2.82 (1.17)	2.36 (0.81)	2.27 (0.79)	2.27 (0.65)	1.91 (0.70)	1.73 (1.47)	2.18 (0.60)	2.00 (0.89)	3.18 (0.87)	2.09 (0.70)	1.82 (0.75)	2.36 (0.81)	2.09 (0.83)	2.09 (0.70)	2.09 (0.54)	2.00 (0.63)
Withdrawal from Confrontation	3.00 (1.41)	4.45 (0.69)	3.64 (1.03)	3.82 (1.66)	4.45 (0.52)	4.36 (0.50)	4.27 (0.65)	4.64 (0.50)	3.18 (1.47)	4.27 (0.90)	3.73 (1.49)	4.00 (1.00)	4.55 (0.52)	4.36 (0.81)	4.18 (0.87)	4.45 (0.69)
Withdrawal from Relationship (R)	2.12 (1.25)	1.45 (0.93)	1.45 (0.52)	1.55 (0.69)	1.18 (0.40)	1.18 (0.40)	1.36 (0.50)	1.09 (0.30)	1.91 (1.04)	1.09 (0.30)	1.27 (0.65)	1.55 (0.82)	1.18 (0.40)	1.36 (0.67)	1.45 (0.69)	1.18 (0.40)
Effectiveness (R)	4.55 (0.69)	3.27 (1.10)	4.18 (0.60)	4.36 (0.50)	3.27 (1.62)	3.36 (1.29)	2.91 (1.04)	1.73 (1.01)	4.55 (1.04)	3.36 (1.27)	4.55 (0.52)	4.09 (0.70)	2.82 (1.33)	3.36 (0.92)	2.82 (1.17)	2.27 (1.01)
Identification	1.55 (0.69)	2.91 (0.94)	1.64 (0.50)	2.18 (1.47)	2.82 (1.33)	2.64 (0.92)	3.18 (0.87)	3.64 (1.12)	1.36 (0.67)	2.73 (1.10)	2.09 (0.70)	2.18 (0.60)	2.55 (1.04)	2.18 (0.87)	2.91 (0.70)	3.45 (1.13)

Figure 1

Multiple Comparisons of the Effects of Components of the Model on Females' Rating of Clarity of Confrontation

Component:	None	F	C	FC	B	BF	BC	BFC
Mean:	4.67	4.51	3.56	2.96	2.41	2.15	1.98	1.46
Duncan's Multiple Range:	———		——	——	———	———		——
						———		

Means underlined by a common line are not significantly different $p<.01$

Higher scores indicate less clarity

Figure 2

Multiple Comparisons of the Effects of Components of the Model on Females' Rating of Willingness to Change Behavior

Component:	F	None	C	FC	B	BF	BC	BFC
Mean:	2.08	2.22	2.74	2.93	2.99	3.16	3.36	3.79
Duncan's Multiple Range:	———	———	———	———	———	———		———

Means underlined by a common line are not significantly different $p<.01$

Higher scores indicate more willingness to change

Figure 3

Multiple Comparisons of the Effects of Components of the Model on Females' Rating of Openness to Negotiation

Component:	None	F	C	FC	B	BC	BF	BFC
Mean:	3.97	3.35	3.18	3.07	2.73	2.72	2.70	2.23
Duncan's Multiple Range:	_____	_____			_____			_____

Means underlined by a common line are not significantly different $p < .01$

Higher scores indicate less openness to negotiation

Figure 4

Multiple Comparisons of the Effects of Components of the Model on Females' Rating of Understanding of Confronter's Point of View

Component:	None	F	C	FC	B	BC	BF	BFC
Mean:	1.47	1.70	2.42	2.86	3.04	3.42	3.61	4.14
Duncan's Multiple Range:	———		———	———		———		———

Mean underlined by a common line are not significantly different $p<.01$

Higher scores indicate more understanding

Figure 5

Multiple Comparisons of the Effects of Components of the Model on Females' Rating of Anger

Component:	None	C	FC	BC	F	BF	BFC	B
Mean:	2.92	3.88	3.91	4.10	4.18	4.23	4.29	4.34

Duncan's Multiple Range: None | C, FC | BC, F | BF, BFC, B

Means underlined by a common line are not significantly different $p < .01$

Higher scores indicate a less angry reaction

Figure 6

Multiple Comparisons of the Effects of Components of the Model on Females' Rating of Defensiveness

Component:	None	C	FC	F	BC	BF	BFC	B
Mean:	3.41	2.61	2.43	2.33	2.31	2.26	2.25	2.22
Duncan's Multiple Range:	———	———	———	———	———	———	———	———

Means underlined by a common line are not significantly different $p < .01$

Higher scores indicate more defensiveness

Figure 7

Multiple Comparisons of the Effects of Components of the Model on Females' Rating of Desire to Withdraw from Confrontation

Component:	None	C	F	FC	BC	BF	B	BFC
Mean:	3.10	4.04	4.07	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.35	4.42
Duncan's Multiple Range:	———	———————————————————————						

Means underlined by a common line are not significantly different $p<.01$

Higher scores indicate less desire for withdrawal

Figure 8

Multiple Comparisons of the Effects of Components of the Model on Females' Rating of Desire to Withdraw from the Relationship

Component:	None	C	FC	F	BC	BFC	BC	B
Mean:	2.39	1.63	1.61	1.47	1.46	1.36	1.33	1.32
Duncan's Multiple Range:								

Means underlined by a common line are not significantly different $p < .01$

Higher scores indicate more desire for withdrawal

Figure 9

Multiple Comparisons of the Effects of Components of the Model on Females' Rating of Effectiveness of Confrontation

Component:	F	None	C	B	FC	BC	BF	BFC
Mean:	4.28	4.09	3.85	3.45	3.44	3.09	2.78	2.36
Duncan's Multiple Range:	———	———	———	———	———	———	———	———

Means underlined by a common line are not significantly different $p < .01$

Higher scores indicate lower effectiveness

Figure 10

Multiple Comparisons of the Effects of Components of the Model on Females' Rating of Identification with Confrontee

Component:	F	None	C	FC	B	BF	BC	BFC
Mean:	2.13	2.24	2.51	2.66	2.76	2.99	3.27	3.58
Duncan's Multiple Range:								

Means underlined by a common line are not significantly different $p < .01$

Higher scores indicate more identification